REMARKS

The applicant has carefully considered the office action dated April 16, 2009, and the references it cites. By way of the foregoing amendments, claims 31, 37-42, 44, 45, 48-52, 54 and 56-63 have been amended, claims 53 and 64 have been cancelled, and claims 65 and 66 have been added. Claims 31, 45, 57, and 59 are independent. In view of the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 31, 37-42, 44, 45, 48-54 and 56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Delgado (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0076570) in view of Linstadt (U.S.1,802,519). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 31 and its dependents

Claim 31 relates to a door including a panel retention system having a track follower movably coupled to the lower track and a housing coupled along a longitudinal side of the door panel and in which a biasing element is positioned. The biasing element is operatively coupled to the track follower and has a longitudinal axis that is substantially parallel to the longitudinal side of the door panel.

Delgado, as depicted in FIGS. 2 and 3, includes a biasing means 34 (i.e., a torsion spring) having a longitudinal axis that is perpendicular to a trailing edge 15 of a door panel 14. (See generally, '570, pg. 2, para. [0033], ln. 4; '570, pg. 2, para. 33, ln. 4; pg. 3, para. [0042], lns. 7-11). The perpendicular orientation of the longitudinal axis of the biasing means 34 relative to the trailing edge 15 of the door panel 14 enables the biasing means 34 to bias a guide follower 24 about the pivot point provided by a throughway 30 and into engagement with a guide 22. (See generally, '570, pg. 3, para. [0041], lns. 5-7; '570, pg. 3, para. [0043], lns. 7-8). Thus, Delgado does not show or describe a biasing element having a longitudinal axis that is substantially parallel to a longitudinal side of a door panel. In fact, Delgado shows the ***exact opposite*** relationship between the biasing means 34 and the trailing edge 15.

Turning to Linstadt, which is directed to retention of a barn door, similar deficiencies exist. Specifically, as depicted in FIGS. 1 and 2 of Linstadt, a coiled spring 14 is positioned in a cap or cup 15 having a longitudinal axis that is perpendicular to a longitudinal axis of the door structure 3. The orientation of the spring in Linstadt is opposite of the claimed orientation of being substantially parallel to a longitudinal side of a door panel. The orientation of the longitudinal axis of the coiled spring 14 relative to the door structure 3 of Linstadt enables the coiled spring 14 to urge a tongue 13 of a holding member 12 toward and into engagement with a track 8, thereby "effectively holding the lower part of the door in position against the door sill." ('519, pg. 1, lns. 4-7). Thus, Linstadt fails to show or describe a biasing element having a longitudinal axis that is substantially parallel to a longitudinal side of a door panel.

Both Delgado and Linstadt fail to show or describe a biasing element having a longitudinal axis that is substantially parallel to a longitudinal side of a door panel. Thus, Delgado and Linstadt cannot anticipate claim 31. Likewise, because Delgado and Linstadt are similarly deficient, no combination of Delgado and Linstadt can render obvious claim 31. Allowance of claim 31 and the claims dependent therefrom is respectfully requested.

Claim 45 and its dependents

Claim 45 relates to a door including a panel retention system having a housing coupled to a longitudinal side or face of the door panel and in which a biasing element is positioned. A longitudinal axis of the housing is substantially parallel to the longitudinal side or face of the door panel. Additionally, the panel retention system includes a track follower and an elongate member. An interaction between the housing, the biasing element and the elongate member at least partially extends the biasing element within the housing.

As depicted in FIGS. 2 and 3 of Delgado, the guide follower 24 has a longitudinal axis that is substantially perpendicular to the trailing edge 15 of the door panel 14; this is directly the opposite of being parallel to the trailing edge 15. Specifically, the position of the longitudinal axis of the guide follower 24 relative to the trailing edge 15 enables the guide follower 24 to be in operable engagement with the guide 22 and allows for substantially continuous engagement between the guide follower 24 and the guide 22 until sufficient force is transferred to the biasing means. ('570, pg. 3, para. [0042], lns. 1-6; 570, pg. 3, para. [0043], lns. 5-7). Thus, Delgado does not show or describe a housing

having a longitudinal axis that is substantially parallel to the longitudinal side or face of the door panel.

Similar deficiencies exist in Linstadt. Specifically, as depicted in FIGS. 1 and 2 of Linstadt, a cap or cup 15 in which a coiled spring 14 is positioned has a longitudinal axis that is perpendicular to a longitudinal axis of the door structure 3, which is the opposite of being parallel to the longitudinal axis. The orientation of the longitudinal axis of the cap or cup 15 relative to the door structure 3 enables the holding member 12 to be positioned through the cap or cup 15 and coupled thereto via the transversely extending key or pin 16. Linstadt derives advantages from the perpendicular arrangement it describes. Linstadt, however, fails to show or describe a housing having a longitudinal axis that is substantially parallel to the longitudinal side or face of the door panel.

Both Delgado and Linstadt fail to show or describe a housing having a longitudinal axis that is substantially parallel to the longitudinal side or face of the door panel. Thus, Delgado and Linstadt cannot anticipate claim 45. Likewise, because Delgado and Linstadt are similarly deficient, no combination of Delgado and Linstadt can render obvious claim 45. Allowance of claim 45 and the claims dependent therefrom is respectfully requested.

While the foregoing demonstrates one example reason why claim 45 is not anticipated by or obvious over Delgado and Linstadt, other reasons exist. For example, as explained below, neither Delgado nor Linstadt has an interaction between a housing, a biasing element and an elongate member that at least partially extends the biasing element within the housing. For example, because a biasing means 34 of Delgado is

preferably a torsion spring, the interaction between a guide follower 24 and the biasing means 34 twists the biasing means 34 relative to the guide follower 24, as opposed to extending a biasing element within a housing. If the biasing means 34 were not twisted relative to the guide follower 24, the biasing means 24 would not bias the guide follower 24 about the pivot point provided by a throughway 30 and into engagement with a guide 22. (See generally, '570, pg. 3, para. [0041], lns. 5-7; '570, pg. 3, para. [0043], lns. 7-8). Thus, Delgado fails to show or describe an interaction between a housing, a biasing element and a elongate member that at least partially extends the biasing element within the housing.

Similarly, turning to Linstadt, the interaction between the coil spring 14, the cap or cup 15 and the holding member 12 compresses the coiled spring 14 within the cap or cup 15, which is ***exactly the opposite of*** extending the biasing element within the housing. If the coiled spring 14 of Linstadt were not to be compressed within the cap or cup 15, the primary object of the invention to "provide a barn door bottom track and guide which will effectively hold the lower part of the door in position against the door sill" ('519, pg. 1, lns. 4-7) would not be achieved. Thus, Linstadt derives advantages from its configuration and fails to show or describe an interaction between a housing, a biasing element and a elongate member that at least partially extends the biasing element within the housing.

Delgado and Linstadt fail to show or describe a housing having a longitudinal axis that is substantially parallel to a longitudinal side or face of a door panel and an interaction between a housing, a biasing element and an elongate member that at least partially extends the biasing element within the housing. Thus, neither Delgado nor

Linstadt, nor their combination, can render independent claim 45 obvious. Allowance of claim 45 and its dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Claim 57 and its dependents

Claim 57 relates to a door that includes a panel retention system having a housing coupled to a longitudinal side or face of the door panel and in which a biasing element is positioned. Additionally, the panel retention system includes a track follower and an elongate member. An interaction between the housing, the biasing element and the elongate member at least partially extends the biasing element within the housing.

As described above, because the biasing means 34 of Delgado is preferably a torsion spring, the interaction between the guide follower 24 and the biasing means 34 twists the biasing means 34 relative to guide follower 24 as opposed to extending a biasing element within a housing. (See generally, '570, pg. 3, para. [0042], lns. 8-11). Thus, Delgado does not describe an interaction between a housing, a biasing element and a elongate member that at least partially extends the biasing element within the housing. Additionally, the interaction between the coil spring 14, the cap or cup 15 and the holding member 12 of Linstadt compresses the coiled spring 14 within the cap or cup 15, which is ***exactly the opposite of*** extending the biasing element within the housing.

Both Delgado and Linstadt fail to show or describe an interaction between a housing, a biasing element and an elongate member that at least partially extends the biasing element within the housing. Thus, neither Delgado nor Linstadt, nor their combination, can render independent claim 57 obvious. Allowance of claim 57 and the claims dependent therefrom is respectfully requested.

Claim 59 and its dependents

Claim 59 relates to a door including a resilient retention system having a housing in which a biasing element is positioned and a track follower. Additionally, the resilient retention system includes an elongate member and a stop coupled to the elongate member to limit the movement of the elongate member relative to the housing.

Delgado, in FIGS. 8-10, includes a stop mechanism 38 that extends from a clamp 36 that surrounds an elongate beam 60 and is engaged by an end of a torsion spring 34 that biases the guide follower 24 about the elongate beam 60. Specifically, the stop mechanism 38 of Delgado limits the movement of the end of the biasing means 34 relative to the elongate beam 60 rather than limiting the movement of the elongate beam 60 relative to any structure described in Delgado. Thus, Delgado does not describe an elongate member and a stop coupled to the elongate member to limit the movement of the elongate member relative to the housing. Linstadt fails to describe any type of stop coupled to a holding member 12 or any other structure. Thus, Linstadt fails to show or describe an elongate member and a stop coupled to the elongate member to limit the movement of the elongate member relative to a housing.

Both Delgado and Linstadt fail to show or describe an elongate member and a stop coupled to the elongate member to limit the movement of the elongate member relative to a housing. Thus, neither Delgado nor Linstadt, nor their combination, can render independent claim 59 obvious. Allowance of claim 59 and the claims dependent therefrom is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner is of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number identified below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the amount enclosed or any additional fees which may be required under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 50-2455.

Please refund any overpayment to Hanley, Flight & Zimmerman, LLC at the address below.

Respectfully submitted,

HANLEY, FLIGHT & ZIMMERMAN, LLC
USPTO Customer No. 34431
150 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2100
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 580-1020

By: /Sergio D. Filice/
Sergio D. Filice
Registration No. 59,727
Attorney for the Applicants

July 24, 2009